REMARKS

The present response is to the action mailed in the above-referenced case on July 20, 2004. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination. In the action claims 1-21 are rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Baldwin (6,560,448) hereinafter Baldwin.

In response to the Examiners rejection and comments, applicant herein presents arguments which clearly distinguish applicant's claimed invention over that of Baldwin.

Regarding claims 1, 5-8, 12-15 and 19-21, the Examiner states that Baldwin discloses a broadband receiving/transmitting system, then proceeds to recite applicant's own claim language from independent claim 8 referencing Figure 2, column 6 line 21 to column 7 line 11, rather than any language from the reference.

Applicant is frustrated with dealing with this tactic of quoting the applicant's claim language and attributing it to a reference. In the Examiner's 102 rejection all of the limitations of claim 8 are quoted and a portion of the reference is cited with absolutely no remarks or reasoning offered by the Examiner. Applicant believes the practice of quoting the applicant's claim language and attributing it to the reference is not responsible. The reference should be quoted for exactly what is says. Because only that is potentially applicable as prior art. A more responsible approach would be for the Examiner to quote the actual reference teaching, and then argue how that teaching reads on the applicant's claim limitations. The Examiner is citing portions of the reference, then quoting parts of applicant's claims which are plainly and clearly not mentioned in the reference.

Applicant makes a considerable effort to write and prosecute clear claims, and expects the Examiner to make a diligent effort at understanding the claimed invention and provide reasonable references and remarks in the examination.

The portion of Baldwin, referenced by the Examiner, describes FIG. 2, which is a simplified schematic and block diagram of a wireless transceiver 200. The wireless transceiver 200 is implemented as a zero intermediate frequency (ZIF) architecture including a ZIF transceiver 201 and a baseband processor 203. The ZIF architecture of Baldwin enables a simplified configuration by entirely eliminating intermediate frequency (IF) logic and associated circuitry. In this manner, only two primary modules, chips, or

IC's (transceiver and processor) are utilized in the ZIF architecture to enable wireless communications.

Baldwin teaches that a problematic characteristic of traditional ZIF architectures is the introduction of substantial DC offset voltages in the receiver that must be compensated for or otherwise eliminated to capture incoming signals and allow communications. The wireless transceiver 200 is configured with an automatic gain control (AGC) loop 345 (FIG. 3) combined with a DC loop 347 to measure and reduce or otherwise eliminate undesired DC in the receiver. Baldwin teaches that the AGC loop 345 includes gain control logic that receives an amplified input signal, that estimates input signal power and that asserts a gain adjust signal in an attempt to keep the input signal power at a target power level. The DC loop 347 includes DC control logic that estimates an amount of DC in the amplified input signal and that provides a DC offset in an attempt to reduce DC in the amplified input signal. Also, a gain interface is provided that converts gain levels between the gain control logic and the DC control logic. Baldwin teaches the wireless transceiver 200 may utilize any desired carrier frequency and modulation technique to achieve any of several corresponding data throughputs.

Alternatively, Baldwin teaches that the wireless transceiver 200 may be configured according to IEEE 802.11a with a carrier frequency of approximately 5 GHz for data throughputs of 6, 12, 18, 24, 36 or 54 Mbps. In the embodiment shown, the wireless transceiver 200 operates in accordance with IEEE 802.11b at a carrier frequency of 2.4 GHz with data throughput rates of 1, 2, 5.5 or 11 Mbps. Baldwin teaches the wireless transceiver 200 may be configured as a plug-in peripheral or expansion card that plugs into an appropriate slot or interface of a computer system.

Applicant argues that Baldwin's invention does not clearly relate to applicant's invention as claimed. Baldwin relates to a DC compensation system for a wireless communication device configured in a zero intermediate frequency (ZIF) architecture that utilizes a DC control loop to enable direct conversion of radio frequency signals to baseband frequency. Baldwin deals with individual appliances at an office or residence communicating via a wireless LAN.

Further, Baldwin's system does not reside on a single IC as recited in applicant's claim 1. Baldwin's system does not teach a first interface for transmitting or receiving

signals in a broadband spectrum, as claimed. Applicant does not see how Baldwin discloses a conversion IC comprising a first interface for transmitting or receiving signals in a broadband spectrum, sideband selection circuit elements coupled to the first interface for up-conversion or down-conversion of the signals to and from an intermediate frequency (IF), a second interface coupled to the circuit elements for receiving and transmitting at the intermediate frequency (IF), and an on-chip voltage-controlled oscillator (VCO) coupled to at least one of the circuit elements through one of frequency multiplication or division circuitry for generating a local-oscillator (LO) signal to that circuit element for conversion between the IF frequency and the receive or transmit frequency in the broadband spectrum.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner try to be more specific when rejecting claim limitations by actually stating which elements in Baldwin's Fig. 2 read on specific elements and limitations of applicant's claimed invention. Applicant believes the Examiner has not properly shown how the reference of Baldwin reads on applicant's invention as claimed.

Therefore, the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable over the art of record. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bert L. Fransis

by 
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
831-726-1457